



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,253	03/09/2005	Sebastian Hallensleben	P17536-US1	2834
27045	7590	04/04/2008	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			GYORFI, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,253

Applicant(s)

HALLENSLEBEN, SEBASTIAN

Examiner

Thomas Gyorfi

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/9/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are pending examination. The preliminary amendment filed 3/9/05 added claims 7-16; amended claims 1, 3, & 4; and cancelled claims 5 & 6.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 3/9/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anton et al (U.S. Patent 7,185,360) in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent 6,163,843).

Regarding claims 1 and 7:

Anton discloses a method and system for requesting access for a user to an application, wherein an entity providing said application can be accessed from at least through a first network and a second network, comprising: granting the user access to the second network (col. 8, lines 45-60; col. 9, lines 20-25); receiving a request for accessing the application from the user (Ibid); detecting that the user already contacted the application via the first network (col. 9, lines 20-45); receiving the requested identifier (Ibid,

and col. 9, lines 45-65); and sending a request for accessing the application and the identifier received from the first network towards the entity providing the application (Ibid, and col. 10, lines 1-45).

Anton does not explicitly disclose wherein requesting from the first network an identifier that has been used by the first network to identify the user towards the entity that provides the application. However, Inoue discloses an analogous system wherein a mobile device attempting to access a remote node from a foreign network may be authenticated by requesting an identifier from its home network (col. 10, lines 50-60; col. 11, lines 25-40; Figure 6). The claims are thus obvious because all of the elements were known in the prior art, and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claim 11:

Anton discloses a system for handling a user request towards an external application wherein a network node providing said application is accessible from a first computer network and a second communication network, said second communication network comprising: means for receiving an access request from said user wherein said access request is for accessing said application associated with said network node (col. 8, lines 45-60; col. 9, lines 20-25); means for determining that the user had previously attempted to access said application using said first communication network (col. 9, lines 20-45); and means for requesting access request to said network node from said second communication network using user information (Ibid, and col. 9, line 45 – col. 10, line 45).

Anton does not explicitly disclose wherein the second communication network has means to request and subsequently receive user information from the first communication network. However, Inoue discloses an analogous system wherein a mobile node connected to a foreign network attempting to

access a service on a remote network will cause the foreign network to contact the mobile node's home network for user information (col. 10, lines 50-60; col. 11, lines 25-40; Figure 6). The claim is thus obvious because all of the elements were known in the prior art, and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claims 2 and 8:

Anton further discloses wherein the first and second network are run by a different operator (col. 11, lines 10-25).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 14:

Inoue further discloses sending authentication information to the first network (Figure 6).

Regarding claims 4 and 10:

Anton further discloses wherein the entity providing the service stores a profile of the user at reception of the first attempt of the user to access the service, wherein the profile is associated with the identification sent from the first network and wherein the second network uses the same identification for the user towards the entity providing the service in order to achieve that the stored profile is used for the user (col. 9, line 45 – col. 10, line 35; cf. col. 5, lines 5-20).

Regarding claim 12:

Anton further discloses wherein said user information includes user identification data used by said first communication network in communicating with said network node (col. 10, lines 15-35).

Art Unit: 2135

Regarding claim 13:

Anton further discloses wherein said user information includes user preference information used by said first communication network in communicating with said network node (using cookies: col. 5, lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 15:

Anton further discloses receiving an indicator from said user (col. 9, lines 25-45).

Regarding claim 16:

Inoue further discloses means for determining that the user had been ported from said first communication network to said second communication network (col. 8, 27-32).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
 - U.S. Patents 7,185,359; 6,826,692; 6,704,789; & 5,655,077
 - U.S. Patent Application Publications 2003/0163733, 2003/0120948, 2002/0060994, and 2002/0035699
 - "RFC2002: IP Mobility Support" by C. Perkins. Published October 1996
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Gyorfí whose telephone number is (571)272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TAG
3/24/08

/KIMYEN VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135